

Gating Placement Analysis Worksheet

Airline: American Airlines

| Factor | Airline Data | Additional Information | Comments | Possible Points | Awarded Points |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Number of Pref. Gates Requested ¹ | <u>6</u> | | | 5 | <u>4.5</u> |
| Airline Club Requested | <u>Yes</u> | | | 7 | <u>7</u> |
| International Flights | <u>No</u> | | | 5 | <u>0</u> |
| Relevant International Code Share(s) | <u>No</u> | | | 4 | <u>0</u> |
| Current EPax Levels ² | <u>WN, AA, DL</u> | | | 5 | <u>4</u> |
| "Fit" into SAT ³ | | | | 7 | <u>7</u> |
| Service, Growth, Experience ⁴ | | | | 7 | <u>7</u> |
| Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax ⁵ | | | | N/A | |
| Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates ⁶ | | | | N/A | |
| Terminal Load Balancing Considerations ⁷ | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total: | --- | --- | --- | 40 | <u>- 29.5 -</u> |

Footnotes:



1. Gate points as follows: 1-2: 2 points 3-4: 3 points 4-5: 4 points 6+: 5 points
2. Current EPax rank points as follows: 4th Quartile: 2 points 3rd Quartile: 3 points 2nd Quartile: 4 points 1st Quartile: 5 points
3. “Fit” into SAT relates to desirability of passenger profile (business, leisure, mix, etc) and airline brand position (network, ULCC, established, start-up, etc)
4. Service, Growth, Experience is intended to account for airlines overall reasonable growth potential and commitment to SAT, aspirations for international flights and any differentiation of product or technology used that would enhance customer experience.
5. “Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax” is to account for definitive written commitment, with meaningful breach provisions, to provide specific city pair service, a minimum level of flights or level of enplaned passengers. Could be a contingent commitment (ex. if route authority is granted, carrier will provide daily non-stop serviced to DCA for __ years).
6. Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates” considers the potential for a carrier to grow incrementally beyond its preferential gates and/or for the use of city gates for RON aircraft. The availability of usable city gates for IROPs is also a factor that is considered.
7. As carriers are prioritized for assignment to Terminal C, it is necessary to view the airport’s operations as a whole and determine what is advisable from an airport-wide balancing viewpoint. Among the areas for consideration are impacts upon Baggage Make Up area, the BHS, the airport roadway system, the passenger and commercial curbs and the ticketing lobby.

Scoring Notes

"Fit" into SAT:

Network carrier. Business traveler appeal plus leisure appeal.

Recommendation:

Terminal C

Service, Growth, & Experience:

Split cabin, Top-tier club experience. Hub feed. Growth potential viewed in conjunction with already high epax and club commitment. Known DC commitment.

High e pax, club and number of gates --> Key factors

Written Commitments:

Need for City Gates:

Terminal Load Balancing:

Draft



Gating Placement Analysis Worksheet

Airline:

| Factor | Airline Data | Additional Information | Comments | Possible Points | Awarded Points |
|--|---|------------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Number of Pref. Gates Requested ¹ | <input type="text" value="5"/> | | | 5 | <input type="text" value="4"/> |
| Airline Club Requested | <input type="text" value="Yes"/> | | | 7 | <input type="text" value="7"/> |
| International Flights | <input type="text" value="No"/> | | | 5 | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| Relevant International Code Share(s) | <input type="text" value="Yes"/> | | | 4 | <input type="text" value="4"/> |
| Current EPax Levels ² | <input type="text" value="WN, AA, DL"/> | | | 5 | <input type="text" value="3"/> |
| "Fit" into SAT ³ | | | | 7 | <input type="text" value="7"/> |
| Service, Growth, Experience ⁴ | | | | 7 | <input type="text" value="6"/> |
| Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax ⁵ | | | | N/A | |
| Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates ⁶ | | | | N/A | |
| Terminal Load Balancing Considerations ⁷ | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total: | --- | --- | --- | 40 | <input type="text" value="- 31 -"/> |

Footnotes:



1. Gate points as follows: 1-2: 2 points 3-4: 3 points 4-5: 4 points 6+: 5 points
2. Current EPax rank points as follows: 4th Quartile: 2 points 3rd Quartile: 3 points 2nd Quartile: 4 points 1st Quartile: 5 points
3. "Fit" into SAT relates to desirability of passenger profile (business, leisure, mix, etc) and airline brand position (network, ULCC, established, start-up, etc)
4. Service, Growth, Experience is intended to account for airlines overall reasonable growth potential and commitment to SAT, aspirations for international flights and any differentiation of product or technology used that would enhance customer experience.
5. "Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax" is to account for definitive written commitment, with meaningful breach provisions, to provide specific city pair service, a minimum level of flights or level of enplaned passengers. Could be a contingent commitment (ex. if route authority is granted, carrier will provide daily non-stop serviced to DCA for __ years).
6. Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates" considers the potential for a carrier to grow incrementally beyond its preferential gates and/or for the use of city gates for RON aircraft. The availability of usable city gates for IROPs is also a factor that is considered.
7. As carriers are prioritized for assignment to Terminal C, it is necessary to view the airport's operations as a whole and determine what is advisable from an airport-wide balancing viewpoint. Among the areas for consideration are impacts upon Baggage Make Up area, the BHS, the airport roadway system, the passenger and commercial curbs and the ticketing lobby.

Scoring Notes

“Fit” into SAT:

Network carrier. Business traveler appeal plus leisure appeal.

Recommendation:

Service, Growth, & Experience:

Split cabin, Top-tier club experience. Hub feed. Code share with Aeromexico. Growth potential viewed in conjunction with commitment to club.

Written Commitments:

Need for City Gates:

Code share opens potential for need for DL gates to be close to Aeromexico Int'l operations.

Terminal Load Balancing:

Draft



Gating Placement Analysis Worksheet

Airline: Southwest Airlines

| Factor | Airline Data | Additional Information | Comments | Possible Points | Awarded Points |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Number of Pref. Gates Requested ¹ | <u>10</u> | | | 5 | <u>5</u> |
| Airline Club Requested | <u>No</u> | | | 7 | <u>0</u> |
| International Flights | <u>Yes</u> | | | 5 | <u>4</u> |
| Relevant International Code Share(s) | <u>No</u> | | | 4 | <u>0</u> |
| Current EPax Levels ² | <u>WN, AA, DL</u> | | | 5 | <u>5</u> |
| "Fit" into SAT ³ | | | | 7 | <u>5</u> |
| Service, Growth, Experience ⁴ | | | | 7 | <u>6</u> |
| Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax ⁵ | | | | N/A | |
| Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates ⁶ | | | | N/A | |
| Terminal Load Balancing Considerations ⁷ | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total: | --- | --- | --- | 40 | <u>- 25.0 -</u> |

Draft

Footnotes:

1. Gate points as follows: 1-2: 2 points 3-4: 3 points 4-5: 4 points 6+: 5 points
2. Current EPax rank points as follows: 4th Quartile: 2 points 3rd Quartile: 3 points 2nd Quartile: 4 points 1st Quartile: 5 points
3. "Fit" into SAT relates to desirability of passenger profile (business, leisure, mix, etc) and airline brand position (network, ULCC, established, start-up, etc)
4. Service, Growth, Experience is intended to account for airlines overall reasonable growth potential and commitment to SAT, aspirations for international flights and any differentiation of product or technology used that would enhance customer experience.
5. "Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax" is to account for definitive written commitment, with meaningful breach provisions, to provide specific city pair service, a minimum level of flights or level of enplaned passengers. Could be a contingent commitment (ex. if route authority is granted, carrier will provide daily non-stop serviced to DCA for __ years).
6. Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates" considers the potential for a carrier to grow incrementally beyond its preferential gates and/or for the use of city gates for RON aircraft. The availability of usable city gates for IROPs is also a factor that is considered.
7. As carriers are prioritized for assignment to Terminal C, it is necessary to view the airport's operations as a whole and determine what is advisable from an airport-wide balancing viewpoint. Among the areas for consideration are impacts upon Baggage Make Up area, the BHS, the airport roadway system, the passenger and commercial curbs and the ticketing lobby.

Scoring Notes

"Fit" into SAT:

Point to point with "focus city"

Recommendation:

Service, Growth, & Experience:

Single class cabin. Different boarding experience Growth potential viewed in conjunction with already high epax. Seeking SAT-DC authority.

Written Commitments:

Need for City Gates:

Draft

Terminal Load Balancing:



Gating Placement Analysis WorksheetAirline: United Airlines

| Factor | Airline Data | Additional Information | Comments | Possible Points | Awarded Points |
|--|--|------------------------|----------|-----------------|--|
| Number of Pref. Gates Requested ¹ | 6 | | | 5 | 4 |
| Airline Club Requested | Yes | | | 7 | 7 |
| International Flights | No | | | 5 | 0 |
| Relevant International Code Share(s) | No | | | 4 | 0 |
| Current EPax Levels ² | WN, AA, DL | | | 5 | 3 |
| "Fit" into SAT ³ | | | | 7 | 5 |
| Service, Growth, Experience ⁴ | | | | 7 | 6 |
| Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax ⁵ | | | | N/A | |
| Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates ⁶ | | | | N/A | |
| Terminal Load Balancing Considerations ⁷ | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total: | --- | --- | --- | 40 | - 25.0 - |

Footnotes:



1. Gate points as follows: 1-2: 2 points 3-4: 3 points 4-5: 4 points 6+: 5 points
2. Current EPax rank points as follows: 4th Quartile: 2 points 3rd Quartile: 3 points 2nd Quartile: 4 points 1st Quartile: 5 points
3. “Fit” into SAT relates to desirability of passenger profile (business, leisure, mix, etc) and airline brand position (network, ULCC, established, start-up, etc)
4. Service, Growth, Experience is intended to account for airlines overall reasonable growth potential and commitment to SAT, aspirations for international flights and any differentiation of product or technology used that would enhance customer experience.
5. “Written Commitment To City Pairs, Flights or EPax” is to account for definitive written commitment, with meaningful breach provisions, to provide specific city pair service, a minimum level of flights or level of enplaned passengers. Could be a contingent commitment (ex. if route authority is granted, carrier will provide daily non-stop serviced to DCA for __ years).
6. Possible Need For Appurtenant City Gates” considers the potential for a carrier to grow incrementally beyond its preferential gates and/or for the use of city gates for RON aircraft. The availability of usable city gates for IROPs is also a factor that is considered.
7. As carriers are prioritized for assignment to Terminal C, it is necessary to view the airport’s operations as a whole and determine what is advisable from an airport-wide balancing viewpoint. Among the areas for consideration are impacts upon Baggage Make Up area, the BHS, the airport roadway system, the passenger and commercial curbs and the ticketing lobby.

Scoring Notes

“Fit” into SAT:

Network carrier. Business traveler appeal plus leisure appeal.

Recommendation:

Service, Growth, & Experience:

Split cabin, Club experience. Hub feed. Growth potential viewed in light of HQ visit and commitment to club.

Written Commitments:

Need for City Gates:

Draft

Terminal Load Balancing:

